



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/825,431	04/03/2001	Stuart D. Baker	209.1001	2071

7590 09/14/2007
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, NY 10018

EXAMINER

SINGH, RACHNA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/14/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/825,431

Applicant(s)

BAKER ET AL.

Examiner

Rachna Singh

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07/09/07.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27, 41-59, 71 and 72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27, 41-59, and 71-72 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request for Reconsideration filed on 07/09/07.

2. Claims 1-27, 41-59, 71 and 72 are currently pending. Claims 1, 18, 41, 49, 57, 71, and 72 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-27, 41-59, 71 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dickinson, III et al. ("Dickinson"), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0196098, in further view of Liu et al. ("Liu"), U.S. Patent No. 6,760,752.**

Regarding independent claim 1, Dickinson discloses:

A digital communication system to denote confidentiality of a digital communication comprising (see Title and Abstract):

a memory containing a program executable by the processor to (see para [0018] → The system takes the form of a program executing on a conventional general purpose computer):

attach a privileged attribute to a digital communication (see paras [0023], [0025], and [0030-0031] → The policy modules operate on confidential attachments to e-mails to require either encryption, signature, or both, in order to enforce attorney-client privileges);

*create a privileged distribution list of at least one intended recipient (see paras [0022-0023] → Dickinson teaches a recipient policy list); and
a second memory containing a program executable by a processor to:*

restrict access to the privileged digital communication to the at least one intended recipient (see paras [0009], [0024] and [0030-0031]: The policy modules operate on confidential attachments to e-mails to require either encryption, signature, or both, in order to enforce attorney-client privileges);

restrict routing of the privileged digital communication to the at least one intended recipient (see paras [0009], [0024] and [0030-0031]: Dickinson teaches a recipient policy list) and,

store the privileged digital communication in a segregated location (...) on a data storage device (see paras [0010] and [0040-0041] → The messages may be stored at specific segregated destinations or queues).

Dickinson does not explicitly disclose Applicant's newly amended claim language ("*a first memory*", "*a second memory*", "*associate the privileged distribution list with the digital communication*") that limits the digital communication system to a system wherein the communication itself controls the disposition of where the communication may be sent (see Applicant's Argument pg. 12). Dickinson also does not explicitly disclose a segregated location specifically for privileged digital communications.

However, Liu discloses a secure transmission system wherein a first memory attaches an encrypted/confidential signed message as an attachment to an e-mail message and transmits the e-mail message to the intended recipient of the distribution list (see col. 1 lines 54-65 and col. 2 lines 45-51).

Liu further discloses a second memory that restricts access and routing of the encrypted/confidential communication (see column 1, lines 54-65 and column 2, lines 46-51. col. 2 lines 1-4, 62-67; col. 3 lines 35-52).

Moreover, Liu discloses storing the digital communication in a segregated location for privileged communications (see col. 21 lines 6-20).

Since both references are from the same field of endeavor, the motivational purpose of providing secure data transmissions between Internet users as disclosed by Liu would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Dickinson. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Dickinson with the teachings of Liu to include a system wherein

Art Unit: 2176

the communication itself controls the disposition of where the communication may be sent and a segregated location specifically for privileged digital communications.

Independent claim 18 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as independent claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding claim 2, Dickinson, in view of Liu, disclose wherein the at least one intended recipient is a plurality of intended recipients (see para [0031] → policies can be applied to users, either individually or by groupings).

Regarding claim 3, Dickinson, in view of Liu, disclose a mail server (see para [0034]); a segregated server housing the segregated location (...) (see paras [0034-0038]); wherein the program is further executable to send a copy of the communication to the segregated server (see paras [0010], [0034-0038], and [0040-0041]), and a segregated location for privileged digital communications.

Regarding claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 19, 20, 41, 42, 46, 47, 51, and 52, Dickinson, in view of Liu, disclose a communication system (i.e. e-mail) containing a plurality of user specified information fields, such as source field specifying an e-mail address for the source of the message, a destination field specifying one or more destination e-mail addresses for the message, a subject field specifying a subject for the message, a

Art Unit: 2176

body field specifying the body of the message containing textual and/or graphics data, and an optional attachment field, specifying one or more files to be transmitted with the message. Other user specified fields include, but are not limited to, priority of the message, identity of the sending agent, and the date and time of the message (see para [0019]).

Dickinson does not explicitly disclose sending a copy as a blind carbon copy, a characteristic including a department of a corporation using the system, forwarding of the communication, and copying and cutting contents into another location.

However, it was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art and would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include sending a copy as a blind carbon copy, a characteristic including a department of a corporation using the system, forwarding of the communication, and copying and cutting contents into another location (e.g. Microsoft Outlook, Hotmail, Yahoo! Mail, etc.) for the motivational purpose of comprising the major common functional components of a user-friendly e-mail system.

Regarding claims 6 and 50, Dickinson, in view of Liu, disclose configuring access rights to the digital communication when the document is opened and to enforce said access rights by managing access to the digital communication and controlling the manipulation of its contents (see paras [0009], [0024] and [0030-0031]).

Regarding claims 9, 21, and 54, Dickinson, in view of Liu, disclose executing automatically and attaching the privileged attribute or the executable module to particular communications according to predetermined selection criteria (see para [0022-0031]; please refer also to the rationale relied upon to reject independent claim 18).

Regarding claims 10, 22, and 55, Dickinson, in view of Liu, disclose a confidentiality notice that is displayed to a user and acknowledged by the user before displaying the privileged communication (see para [0039] → i.e. notification actions).

Regarding claim 11, Dickinson does not explicitly teach acknowledging a confidentiality notice by clicking on a GUI button. However, it was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art and would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include clicking on a GUI button for the motivational purpose acknowledging a pop-up window (*compare with* "confidentiality notice").

Regarding claims 12, 23, 56, and 59, Dickinson, in view of Liu, disclose the system wherein the privileged digital communication is encrypted and decryption methods if a predetermined condition is met (see Abstract and para [0007] et seq.).

Regarding claims 13 and 24, Dickinson, in view of Liu, disclose a server object and a client object (see paras [0034-0037]).

Claims 14, 15, 17, 25, 26, and 53 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as independent claim 1 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding claims 16 and 27, Dickinson, in view of Liu, does not explicitly teach that the client object is a plug-in to a pre-existing communication system. However, Dickinson discloses the S/MIME protocol to exchange secure e-mail messages (see para [0034]). It is well known to a skilled artisan that most plug-in modules (e.g. Navigator) are based on MIME file types that simply plugs in to the existing system.

Therefore, it was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art and would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a plug-in to a pre-existing communication system for the motivational purpose of adding a specific feature or service to a larger system.

Regarding claim 43, Dickinson, in view of Liu, disclose executing automatically and attaching the privileged attribute to particular communications according to predetermined selection criteria (see para [0022-0031]).

Regarding claims 44, Dickinson, in view of Liu, disclose a confidentiality notice that is displayed to a user and acknowledged by the user before displaying the privileged communication (see para [0039] → i.e., notification actions).

Regarding claims 45, Dickinson, in view of Liu, disclose the system wherein the privileged digital communication is encrypted and decryption methods if a predetermined condition is met (see Abstract and para [0007] et seq.).

Claim 48 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as independent claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

With respect to independent claims 49, 71 and 72, please refer to the rationale relied upon to reject independent claim 18, which contains substantially similar subject matter, as discussed above.

Claims 57 and 58 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as independent claim 18 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to newly amended claims filed on 07/09/07 have been considered but are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2176

On pages 11-12 of the Remarks, Applicant argues the Dickinson and Liu reference are not combinable because Liu teaches away from the combination. Specifically, Applicant argues Liu teaches away from using firewalls and therefore is not combinable with Dickinson. Examiner disagrees. Dickinson and Liu are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor and providing secure data transmissions between Internet users as disclosed by Liu was desirable at the time of the invention and would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Dickinson.

On page 12 of the Remarks, Applicant argues Liu does not teach or suggest a system wherein the communication itself controls the disposition of where the communication may be sent as recited in the claims. Examiner respectfully disagrees as Liu teaches delivering an e-mail message (i.e. communication) to a designated recipient's email address which meets the limitation, ***associating the privileged distribution list with the digital communication***. See column 1, lines 54-65 and column 2, lines 46-51. Therefore, Liu teaches the communication is associated with a distribution list.

On pages 12-13 of the Remarks, Applicant argues Liu does not teach a second memory that restricts access and routing of the encrypted/confidential communication. Examiner disagrees. Liu teaches routing the encrypted message to a designated recipient. See column 1, lines 54-65, column 2, lines 46-51, col. 3, lines 35-52. Liu teaches accessing and routing an email message to a designated recipient. With respect to Applicant's argument that Liu does not teach attaching a privileged distribution list to the message itself, it is noted that the claim recites attaching a

privileged **attribute** to the communication not a privileged distribution list. While the claim may recite associating the privileged distribution list to the communication, it does not recite attaching the list. Liu teaches associating a distribution list (i.e. recipient list) with the communication as in columns 1, lines 54-65 and column 2, lines 46-51. Therefore, Liu teaches restricting the routing and accessing of the communication according to a distribution list.

On pages 13-15, Applicant argues the prior art references do not teach various claimed features of the invention. It is noted Applicant's arguments, beginning on the bottom of page 13 and through page 15, fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Accordingly, the Examiner maintains these limitations are taught by the references as outlined in the rejections above.

In view of the comments above, the rejections are maintained.

Conclusion

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not


Art Unit: 2176

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh whose telephone number is 571-272-4099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30AM-6:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Rachna Singh
09/10/07